

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
for the  
Western District of Michigan  
Southern Division

**FILED - GR**  
October 22, 2018 9:51 AM  
CLERK OF COURT  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
BY: mikc SCANNED BY: 10/22/18

Vance, Jr., James Donald, Plaintiff )

V. )

Grand Rapids Housing Commission, Defendant )

Case Number:

No Jury

**1:18-cv-1188**

**Robert J. Jonker**  
Chief U.S. District Judge

**I. The Parties to This Complaint**

**A. PLAINTIFF:**

James Donald Vance, Jr.  
1425 Bridge St. NW, apartment 122  
Grand Rapids, Kent County  
Michigan, 49504.  
(616) 304 – 7195  
[jamesvance1358@att.net](mailto:jamesvance1358@att.net)

**B. DEFENDANT:**

Grand Rapids Housing Commission  
1420 Fuller Ave. SE  
Grand Rapids, Kent County  
Michigan, 49507.  
(616) 235 – 2600

**II. Basis for Jurisdiction** is a Federal question. The specific federal statutes, federal treaties, and/or provisions of the United States Constitution that are at issue in this case are:

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)  
McDonald v. Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (2010)  
U.S. Constitution, Amendment 2

**III. Statement of Claim**

It is my intention to prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Grand Rapids Housing Commission's anti weapon policy, which reads, "Tenants are not to display, use or possess or allow members of the tenant's household or guests to display, use or possess any firearms (operable or inoperable), weapons (such as, but not limited to, nun chucks, knives, swords, sabers, etc.) as defined by the laws and courts of the State of Michigan, or use any object with the intent to cause harm anywhere on the property of Mt. Mercy." is unconstitutional.

**IV. Relief:** To establish a legal precedence in the State of Michigan. To determine the unconstitutionality of the Housing Commission's anti weapons policy, as determined by existing legal precedence, and override it.

**V. Certification and Closing**

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

**Date of Signing,** October 22, 2018

**Signature of Plaintiff,**

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "James D. Vance Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

**Printed Name of Plaintiff,** James Donald Vance, Jr.